REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 remain pending in the application, as claims 6 and 15 were previously canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 10-12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,040,680 to Toya, et al. (Toya). In addition, claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175658 to Watts, et al. (Watts). Claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,320,354 to Sengupta, et al. (Sengupta). Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,668 to Chao (Chao) in view of Sengupta. Finally, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sengupta in view of Toya.

Independent claim 1 includes the limitations that the battery includes the first charging circuit and provides power to an electronic device, that the electronic device includes the second charging circuit and that the second charging circuit is capable of directing charging current to the battery if charging current is being fed to the electronic device. Independent claims 10 and 19 contain similar limitations. Applicants submit that none of the cited prior art references disclose such features. In particular, Toya merely discloses a battery pack that includes a secondary coil and a control circuit for controlling power induced in the secondary coil (see Abstract). Toya simply mentions nothing about a second charging circuit being positioned within an electronic device in which the second charging circuit can provide a charging current to the battery pack when the electronic device is receiving a charging current.

Moreover, Toya actually teaches away from having an additional charging circuit in the portable electrical device (103). Specifically, the main thrust of Toya, which relies on wireless charging to charge the battery pack (102), is directed to avoiding dirty charging terminals that block the efficient transfer of electrical energy (see col. 1, lines 41-50 and col. 2, lines 60-64). Because Toya relies on wireless charging to charge the battery pack (102), no external contacts are required for the battery pack (102), particularly when the battery pack (102) is coupled with the portable electrical device (103) (see FIG. 1 and col. 3, lines 34-37). Thus, in addition to never describing a charging circuit in the portable electrical device (103), Toya even teaches away from such a configuration, given its ambition to eliminate exposed contacts, which would be necessary if the device (103) included a second charging circuit.

Concerning the rejection of claims 9 and 18, Applicants note that these claims have been amended to clarify that the input/output line is selectively toggled between high, release and low states and that the release state is a value that is between the high and low states. Support for the amendments can be found in FIGs. 4 and 5 and on page 13, lines 2-7 of the application. No new matter has been added in view of the amendments. Applicants submit that none of the cited references discloses this feature, which can permit any suitable component to take conventional measurements on the input/output line.

Moving to the rejection of claim 20, the Examiner has argued that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sengupta by adding the charging circuit of Toya and the process of its disablement to Sengupta. Applicants note that

there is ample evidence to lead one to conclude that one of skill in the art would be dissuaded from attempting to create such a combination. In particular, Sengupta expressly calls for decreasing the complexity and costs of charging circuits and adding the circuitry of Toya directly contradicts this basic premise of Sengupta. Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's notion that ". . . it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sengupta system with the Toya system so that damaging overcharge is prevented" (see paragraph 8, page 7 of the Office Action of August 25, 2006). Sengupta is already configured to prevent overcharging (see col. 5, lines 66 to col. 6, line 9) and in view of its desire for simplicity, a second overcharge protection circuit is unwarranted. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has been unable to counter this contradiction.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the above claims are patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number

indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 13, 2007

By: /Larry G. Brown/
Larry G. Brown

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: 954-723-4295 direct line
Tel: 954-723-6449 main line
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871